



## **Iowa Smart Planning Task Force Meeting September 15, 2010 Meeting Notes**

### **Welcome**

### **Approval of Aug. 11, 2010, Meeting Notes**

- Roman numeral III Change “community” to “committee” updates
- Reorder the notes so that full committee names are listed.
- Minutes approved.

### **Presentation of Draft Committee Recommendations**

*Nancy Richardson*

- Purpose of today’s meeting is not to decide if these are the right recommendations to go to the Governor and General Assembly, but that these are the right recommendations to be used for public input purposes.
- Review not only “what’s there” in the recommendations, but “what’s not there.”
- Encourage all who review the recommendations to submit their comments prior to the October meeting to ensure formal recognition.

*Rick Hunsaker & Emily Shields*

Description of recommendation 1. Opened to questions and comments.

- Within the conceptual diagrams on pages 5,6, and 7, need to add a reference to “resources” at the local level; and change the term “level of investment coordination” to “level of coordinated investment,” referring to state agency coordination of funds when investing in communities. Currently there’s a low level of investment coordination, ideally there would be a high level of coordination.
- Concern was expressed with how the planning office/entity will work with two councils.

Description of recommendation 1.1. Opened to questions and comments.

- Concern was expressed with language suggesting the GIS Council have autonomy; the intention is for both the planning and GIS functions to have that autonomy.
- Add Regents institutions to page 9 for the GIS and Data Systems Council
- We need to take a stand on whether this is best housed in an existing agency or independent, recognize the Legislature’s reorganization efforts, and provide flexibility.

Description of recommendation 1.2. Opened to questions and comments.

No comments.

Description of recommendation 1.3. Opened to questions and comments.

- Concern was expressed concerning timing of regional plans versus the watershed plans (Draft Recommendation #4). Ideally the watershed plans would be completed first. Over time, the issue will work itself out as the regional plans are updated. Emphasize that if regional plans are done first, it is necessary to have them reconsidered after the watershed plans are developed.
- Need to encourage multi-regional cooperation, as well.
- A regional plan will cover an entire region, but will not include specific community plans. Don’t want the region to make assumptions for local governments. Regional plans would be very goal

oriented; if communities desire, they can partake in a multi-community plan (for example, multiple small communities pooling their resources for plan development).

Description of recommendation 1.4. Opened to questions and comments.

- Advisory committees exist to ensure transparency within a review process, and ensure that COG staff are not reviewing their own plans.

Description of recommendation 1.5. Opened to questions and comments.

- The recommendation is written in such a way that allows flexibility for local governments in determining how best to structure a new COG(s) while providing greater consistency across the state regarding regional planning. Need to revise introductory sentences to clarify who makes these decisions. The local governments can determine the scope of work for the new COG(s).
- Must be an incentive to do this – they'll develop a COG if there's an incentive to do it.

Description of recommendation 1.6. Opened to questions and comments.

- Need to include a second sentence or paragraph stating that this is only a sampling of benchmarks that could be used. This is not the be-all, end-all. Should only be used as a starting point.
- This is something that has been lacking for some time - no benchmark held for the state agencies or departments. At the local level, it is important that we know we are working in conjunction with the state.

Description of recommendation 2. Opened to questions and comments.

- Determined that five years is appropriate for developing regional plans across the state.
- Should consider adding information here about multi-regional approaches and incorporating watershed plan information.

Description of recommendation 3. Opened to questions and comments.

No comments.

Description of recommendation 3.1. Opened to questions and comments.

No comments.

Description of recommendation 3.2. Opened to questions and comments.

No comments.

Description of recommendation 3.3. Opened to questions and comments.

- How much money have we anticipated it will cost a community to do this? \$10,000 to \$100,000. This may impact small communities' finances.
- Wish to provide multiple funding options for consideration.

Description of recommendation 3.4. Opened to questions and comments.

- All branches of government would need technical assistance and training. OPGIS should also be directed to provide their services to state agencies, not just local and regional.

Description of recommendation 3.5. Opened to questions and comments.

No comments.

Description of recommendation 3.6. Opened to questions and comments.

- Combine this recommendation into 3.3.

Description of recommendation 3.7. Opened to questions and comments.

- There needs to be financial resources provided to Regents institutions to incorporate smart planning issues and principles.
- Expand this recommendation to incorporate training, resources and technical assistance/education across all levels, this could displace recommendation 3.4.

Description of recommendation 3.8. Opened to questions and comments.

- May want to combine this recommendation with 3.7.
- There are resources from non-profits across the state that can leverage public resources.

Description of recommendation 3.9. Opened to questions and comments.

- This might also be combined with another recommendation.

Description of recommendation 4. Opened to questions and comments.

- This recommendation is consistent with the DNR's stance.
- Change text from "watersheds" to "major river basins."

Description of recommendation 5. Opened to questions and comments.

- May also want to consider updating the zoning code in future years.

What isn't in the recommendations? What needs to be added?

- May want to incorporate renewable energy goals somewhere along the benchmarks as one of the samples.

### **Overview of Public Input Sessions**

- Dates, times, locations listed on the agenda.
- Reviewed proposed meeting format document – short presentation followed by small group discussions.
- Determined that two hours would be sufficient: 4:30 to 6:30pm
- Want to make sure that the public really has an opportunity to attend, so allow for the most input possible.
- Must be clear that this is a communication and reaction to the recommendations, not just a presentation.
- People volunteered to "staff" the public input meetings.
- Survey
  - Survey will be available at the events and online. At this point, the survey just has the recommendations listed with "Support, Neutral, Oppose" with opportunities for more input on the back.
  - Add "Recommendations that should be changed, added or deleted" as a field on the back of the survey form.
  - Bold "draft"
  - Spell out terms like COG, etc.
- RIO will put together a press release and media invite. All member organizations will be asked to distribute it to their own networks. Have out by Monday, 8 days before the first meeting.

### **Other Issues**

No directives.

### **Adjourn**